



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the same, substantially restricts interstate commerce, and Congress may in the exercise of the power given by the commerce clause of the constitution, prohibit such contracts.

It is well settled that the Sherman Act is intended to prevent all direct restraint upon interstate commerce of any description whatever and without regard to the reasonableness of the restraint sought to be imposed. *U. S. v. Freight Ass'n*, 166 U. S. 290; *Addyston Pipe Co. v. U. S.*, 175 U. S. 211. This decision extends the operation of the Act by determining more specifically what combinations are in restraint of interstate commerce. Where a third party acquires a majority of the stock of two competing interstate railroads the restraint of interstate commerce is accomplished as effectually as though the two railroads were consolidated under a single charter. It is immaterial that the third party is a corporation. The general language used indicates an intention to comprehend every scheme that might be devised to accomplish that end.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—*QUO WARRANTO*—LACHES.—*STATE EX REL. JACKSON v. TOWN OF MANSFIELD ET AL.*, 72 S. W. 471 (Mo.).—A city was not legally organized but was permitted to use its franchises for eight years. The State sought by *quo warranto* proceedings to deprive the town of its franchises and privileges to exist as a city. *Held*, the State was precluded by its laches.

Laches is not imputable to the government in its character as a sovereign. *United States v. Kirkpatrick*, 9 Wheat. 720, 735. Following this doctrine it would seem that a State could not be precluded by its laches. Yet a municipal corporation may exist by prescription. *Jameson v. People*, 16 Ill. 257. This fact shows that a State may be precluded from an information to deprive a city of its franchises, but on the ground of *acquiescence*, rather than *laches*. *State v. Leatherman*, 38 Ark. 81, 90.

PATENTS—RIGHT TO EQUITABLE RELIEF AGAINST INFRINGEMENT—IMMORAL USE.—*FULLER v. BERGER ET AL.*, 120 FED 274.—The plaintiff, assignee of the inventor, used a patented device for detecting bogus coins in its gambling machines. The defendants without license applied it to gambling machines of their own make. *Held*, that the use which the owner of a patent makes of the invention can not affect his right to an injunction. Grosscup, Circuit J. dissenting.

What the complainant is doing with his property cannot deprive him of his right to invoke the protection of the court against infringement. *Saddle Co. v. Troxel*, 98 Fed. 620. Courts of equity will not refuse redress to the suitor because his conduct in other matters not then before the court may not be blameless. *Paper Co. v. Robertson*, 99 Fed. 985. There are, however, contrary decisions. Where a device is capable of being used for some useful purpose but in reality is used only for gambling purposes, the injunction will be denied. *Novelty Co. v. Dworzek*, 80 Fed. 902. The dissenting opinion is that though the claimant may hold a legal title, the court is under no compulsion of law to issue the writ, so long as sound considerations of public morals and conscience forbid.

PRIVATE CORPORATIONS—ILLEGAL ISSUE OF STOCK—INJUNCTION.—*KRAFT v. GRIFFON CO. ET AL.*, 81 N. Y. SUPP. 438.—Under a statute declaring that nothing but money shall be considered as payment of any part of the capital stock